

REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 6, 2002 presents the examination of claims 1-6. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are canceled. Claim 4 is amended to correct claim dependency. Claims 7-13 are added. No new matter is inserted into the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are canceled, thus rendering rejection thereof moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection applied to claim 4 or if applied to new claims 7-13. Reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the instant rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims 7-13 and claim 4 as amended particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, such that the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph have been met. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by Bormann '307 (U.S. Patent 4,869,307)

Application Number 09/888,568

or Watanabe '336 (U.S. Patent 5,076,336), or Ushikubo '501 (U.S. Patent 4,824,501), or Kojima '198 (U.S. Patent 5,032,198). Claim 1 is canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-4

The Examiner rejects claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Bormann '307 or Watanabe '336, in view of Kojima '198, and optionally Ushikubo '501. Claims 2 and 3 are canceled, thus rendering rejection thereof moot. Claim 4 is amended to depend from newly added claims 9 or 10.

The Examiner acknowledges that neither Bormann '307 nor Watanabe '336 disclose the relationship between density D_n and D_c . The Examiner tries to make up for this deficiency by combining therewith Kojima '198 or Ushikubo '501. Both Kojima '198 and Ushikubo '501 attempt to solve the problem of reinforcement at the shoulders of the tire. However, Kojima '198 and Ushikubo '501 solve the problem by using convex rather than a cylinder drum, as used in the present invention and recited in the instant claims. Therefore, Kojima '198 and Ushikubo '501 teach away from using a cylinder drum.

For these reasons, the present invention is not obvious over

the cited prior art references. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by, or in the alternative, unpatentable over Kojima '198. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are canceled, thus rendering rejection thereof moot. Claim 4 is amended to depend from newly added claims 9 or 10.

Kojima '198 discloses a method for manufacturing a tread. However, as further noted above, it appears that Kojima '198 prefers the use of a convex drum to increase average density, and teaches away from the use of cylinder drum. Thus, although Kojima '198 discloses a cylinder drum, it is not used to create the densities currently recited in claim 2.

For this reasons, the present invention is not obvious over the Kojima '198. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 5

The Examiner rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Ushikubo '501. Claim 5 is canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments and/or remarks fully address and overcome the rejections and objections of record. The instant claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kristi L. Rupert, Ph.D. (Reg. 45,702) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of three (3) months to June 6, 2003, in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$930.00 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees

Application Number 09/888,568

required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17;
particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868


ADM/KLR:gml

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachments

(Rev. 03/27/01)

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the specification:

The paragraph on page 6, lines 3-6, is amended as follows:

The tape 11 is a raw rubber tape in which band cords 10 are embedded along the length thereof in parallel with each other. The width W of the tape 11 is preferably in a [rang] range of from 3 to 20 mm.

In the claims:

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are canceled.

Claims 7-13 are added.

Claim 4 is amended as follows:

4. (Twice Amended) The method according to any one of claims 9 or 10 [claim 2], wherein said plurality of parallel band cords traverse the cylindrical drum along the axis of the drum, and the traversing speed is continuously changed, while rotating the drum at a constant speed, whereby the average density is gradually increased.